arXiv:1405.0227v1 [cond-mat.soft] 1 May 2014

Spontaneous sense inversion in helical mesophases

H. H. Wensink[1,*]

[1] *Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, Université Paris-Sud & CNRS, UMR 8502, 91405 Orsay, France*

(Dated: May 2, 2014)

We investigate the pitch sensitivity of cholesteric phases of helicoidal patchy cylinders as a generic model for chiral (bio-)polymers and helix-shaped colloidal rods. The behaviour of the macroscopic cholesteric pitch is studied from microscopic principles by invoking a simple density functional theory generalised to accommodate weakly twisted director fields. Upon changing the degree of alignment along the local helicoidal director we find that cholesteric phases exhibit a sudden sense inversion whereby the cholesteric phase changes from left- to right-handed and vice versa. Since the local alignment is governed by thermodynamic variables such as density, temperature or the amplitude of an external directional field such pitch sense inversions can be expected in systems of helical mesogens of both thermotropic and lyotropic origin. We show that the spontaneous change of helical symmetry is a direct consequence of an antagonistic effective torque between helical particles with a certain prescribed internal helicity. The results may help opening up new routes towards precise control of the helical handedness of chiral assemblies by a judicious choice of external control parameters.

PACS numbers: 61.30.Cz,64.70.M, 82.70.Dd

Over the past decades considerable research effort has been devoted to understanding the manifestation of macroscopic chirality in lyotropic liquid crystals consisting of colloidal particles or stiff polymers immersed in a solvent. In addition to a number of synthetic helical polymers such as polyisocyanates [1, 2] and polysilanes [3] which form cholesteric phases in organic solvents there is a large class of helical bio-polymers which are known to form cholesteric phases in water. Examples are DNA [4, 5] and the rod-like *fd*-virus [6], polypeptides [7, 8], chiral micelles [9], polysaccharides [10], and microfibrillar cellulose derivatives [11] and chitin [12]. In these systems, the cholesteric pitch is strongly dependent upon the particle concentration, temperature as well as solvent properties such as the ionic strength. The effect of these individual factors on the macroscopic pitch has been the subject of intense experimental research [4, 13–22].

The connection between the molecular interactions responsible for chirality on the microscopic scale and the structure of the macroscopic cholesteric phase is very subtle and has been a long-standing challenge in the physics of liquid crystals [23]. The chiral nature of most biomacromolecules originates from a spatially non-uniform distribution of charges and dipole moments residing on the molecule. The most prominent example is the double-helix backbone structure of the phosphate groups in DNA. Combining the electrostatic interactions with the intrinsic conformation of the molecule allows for a coarse-grained description in terms of an *effective* chiral shape. Examples are bent-core or banana-shaped molecules [24, 25] where the mesogen shape is primarily responsible for chirality. Many other helical bio-polymers and microfibrillar assemblies of chiral molecules (such as cellulose) can be mapped onto effective chiral objects



FIG. 1. Cylinder of dimensions (ℓ, δ) enwrapped with a helical segment potential with internal pitch length p. The helix sense can be right-handed (R) or left-handed (L).

such as a threaded cylinder [24, 26], twisted rod [12, 27] or semi-flexible helix [28].

Despite recent progress in the simulation domain [29, 30] a common theoretical framework capable of rationalising the pitch trends of cholesteric materials starting from the microscopic properties of the constituents remains elusive. In this paper we endeavour to make a first step in this direction by considering a semi-analytical density functional treatment of cholesteric assemblies starting from a generic helical segment model. To establish a microscopic understanding of the subtle connection between micro- and macrochirality we start by deriving the effective chiral potential between two slender helical objects as a generic model for chiral nanoparticles with arbitrary internal helicity. Next, the implications of such chiral potentials on the structure and symmetry of a cholesteric phase will be addressed using statistical mechanical theory. Our chiral potential has a simple pseudoscalar form similar to the ones derived from more explicit electrostatic models in which chiral interactions are me-

* wensink@lps.u-psud.fr

diated through helically arranged local dipoles [31]. Owing to its tractable form the pseudoscalar chiral potential is routinely invoked in particle simulations of cholesteric mesophases [32]. It can also be combined with a Maier-Saupe mean-field theory [33, 34], or with a bare hard-core model and treated with a virial theory [35–37] to study the structural properties of the cholesteric phase. In this work we shall use an extended Onsager theory, due to Straley [24], as a microscopic framework to assess the pitch sensitivity with respect to the helical properties of the constituents as well as the thermodynamic state of the system.

The magnitude and symmetry of the cholesteric pitch turn out to be sensitive to not only the microscopic pitch but also the degree of alignment along the helical director field. The latter, in turn, can be steered by the density (lyotropics), temperature (thermotropics) or by some directional external field. To illustrate the concept, we show that a helix with fixed internal pitch may self-assemble into both right- and left-handed chiral phases whose handedness may spontaneously switch depending on the thermodynamic state of the system. Such pitch inversions have been found in various experimental observations [38, 39] but a sound statistical mechanical underpinning of these phenomena is lacking mainly because the construction of generic, predictive models is strongly impeded by the complicated physico-chemical nature of many thermotropic liquid crystals.

I. MODEL

Let us consider a pair of strongly elongated helices each described by a linear array of rigidly linked soft segments with a radially symmetric interaction potential $u_s(r)$ wrapped around a cylindrical backbone [see fig. 1]. In the continuum limit the potential U_h between two helices with length ℓ depending on the centre-of-mass distance $\mathbf{r}_{12}$ and solid orientation angles Ω_i formally reads:

$$U_h = \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} dt_1 \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} dt_2 u_s(|\mathbf{r}_{12} + \mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2|), \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_i(t_i, \Omega_1)$ denotes the local segment position of rod i parameterized by t_i. A helix of diameter δ can be defined by invoking a molecular orthornormal basis $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{v}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_i\}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ in terms of the longitudinal orientation vector $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and auxiliary unit vectors $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2/|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2|$ and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}$. The contour vector of helix $i = 1, 2$ then takes on the form

$$\mathbf{s}_i = \mathbf{r}_i + \frac{t_i}{2}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i + \frac{\delta}{2}\left\{\cos(qt_i + \psi_i)\hat{\mathbf{v}} + \sin(qt_i + \psi_i)\hat{\mathbf{w}}_i\right\}, \qquad (2)$$

with $q = 2\pi/p$ the internal helical pitch such that $q > 0$ corresponds to a right-handed (R) helix and $q < 0$ to a left-handed (L) one. Since a helical object is *not* invariant with respect to rotations about its longitudinal axis $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i$ the pair potential must explicitly depend on a set of (internal) azimuthal angles $0 \leq \psi_i \leq 2\pi$. To derive a simple expression for the chiral potential associated with the rather intractable form Eq. (1) we follow the procedure outlined in an earlier paper [40]. First, we focus on strongly elongated helices and expand U_h for small width-to-length ratio $\delta/\ell \ll 1$. The leading order term is of $\mathcal{O}((\delta/\ell)^2)$ and embodies all chiral contributions for slender helices. The next step is to mitigate the multi-angular dependency of U_h by constructing an *angle-averaged* chiral potential $\bar{U}_c$ obtained by preaveraging over the internal azimuthal angles. To this end we impose the Helmholtz free energy of the angle-averaged potential to be equal to that of the full angle-dependent potential [41]. Setting the thermal energy k_BT to unity we may write the potential of mean force in the following way:

$$\bar{U}_c = -\ln\langle\exp[-U_h]\rangle_\psi = \langle U_h\rangle_\psi - \frac{1}{2}\left\langle U_h^2\right\rangle_\psi + \cdots, \qquad (3)$$

where the brackets denote a double integral over the internal angles $\langle . \rangle_\psi = (2\pi)^{-2}\int_0^{2\pi} d\psi_1 d\psi_2$. The last term can be identified with the strength of the *azimuthal fluctuations* and is obtained by expanding the free energy up to quadratic order in U_h. It can be readily shown that the simple average yields zero ($\langle U_h\rangle_\psi = 0$) so that only the quadratic fluctuation term survives. This is consistent with the notion that the azimuthal helix-helix correlations play a key role in stabilising cholesteric order, as discussed in [42]. Physical justification of the expansion above relies on the observation that in most experimental systems the cholesteric twist deformation is weak ($\gg \ell$). As a result, the chiral contribution to U_h which is the only part responsible for the formation of a helical director field is generally much smaller than the thermal energy. The integrations over the azimuthal angles are trivial and all contributions invariant under a parity transformation $\mathbf{r}_{12} \to -\mathbf{r}_{12}$ are non-chiral and may be discarded. Combining all relevant contributions leads us to the following compact expression for the chiral potential between two strongly elongated helices with $\delta/\ell \gg 1$:

$$\bar{U}_c(\mathbf{r}_{12}; \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2) \simeq \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\delta}{\ell}\right)^2 \mathcal{F}(r_{12}, q)(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2 \cdot \ell^{-1}\mathbf{r}_{12}). \qquad (4)$$

The term between brackets is a chiral pseudo-scalar which changes sign under a parity transformation and is routinely imposed to describe chiral interactions [31]. We show that this form naturally emerges as the leading-order chiral potential for slender helical objects. Most importantly, however, our prefactor provides direct access to the microscopic helical pitch via:

$$\mathcal{F}(r_{12}, q) = \langle u_s'(\tilde{r}_{12})\cos q\ell t_1\rangle_t \langle u_s'(\tilde{r}_{12}) t_2 \sin q\ell t_1\rangle_t, \qquad (5)$$

in terms of the double contour average $\langle\cdot\rangle_t = \int_{-1}^{1} dt_1 dt_2$, intersegment force $u_s'(x) = -\partial u_s(x)/\partial x$ and linear seg-



FIG. 2. Angular variation of the near-field chiral potential [Eq. (4)] at fixed rod distance 0.1ℓ depends sensitively on the molecular pitch q. The curve for $q\ell = 4$ reveals a double minimum at opposing twist angle γ, irrespective of the nature of the interactions as demonstrated for two different segment potentials u_s. The extrema have been scaled to unity to facilitate comparison.

ment distance $\tilde{r}_{12}^2 = \ell^{-2} r_{12}^2 + \frac{1}{4}(t_1\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 - t_2\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2)^2$. In order to appeal to both lyotropic and thermotropic assemblies of helical building blocks we may consider two different segment potentials. First, a (repulsive) Yukawa segment potential $u_s(r) = u_0 \exp(-\kappa r)/r$, with κ an inverse electrostatic screening length, provides a relevant description of charge-stabilised colloidal helices whose self-assembly properties are governed mainly by particle concentration. To make a connection to thermotropic systems, we consider a van der Waals (vdW) form $u_s(r) = -u_0 r^{-6}$ in which case the system temperature rather than concentration constitutes the chief thermodynamic control parameter owing to the long-ranged attractive interparticle forces. The amplitudes $u_0 > 0$ pertain to various electrophysical properties (surface charge, dielectric constant etcetera) of the individual helices which we do not need to not specify here.

Irrespective of the nature of the segment potential the chiral potential exhibits an intricate angular dependence (fig. 2). Results are shown for a particular interhelix distance of 0.1ℓ but the overall features do not change qualitatively for different values, provided the distance remains larger than the core diameter δ. In particular, the amplitude and direction of the effective torque each helix experiences depends sensitively on its local orientational freedom. Since the latter is tuned primarily by density or temperature we expect a highly non-trivial response of the cholesteric symmetry upon variation of these quantities. Two observations in fig. 2 hint at a subtle relationship between the helical properties of the individual particles and those of the macroscopic phase. First, for $q = 4$ the sign of the effective torque $\tau \sim -(\partial \bar{U}_c/\partial\gamma)_{\gamma=0}$ at small mutual angle $\gamma(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2)$ is opposite to that of the other helices shown. This implies that helices may stabilise a cholesteric helix sense with *opposite* symmetry in the asymptotic limit of strong alignment (*viz.* very large concentrations) [37]. A second, more implicit, observation is that for certain values of q, the local and global minima correspond to *opposite* torque directions. The consequence is that the symmetry of the effective microscopic torque experienced by each helix due to correlations with its neighbours depends crucially on the degree of local alignment along the helical director.

II. ONSAGER-STRALEY THEORY

To scrutinise the effect of these subtleties on the macroscale we invoke a simple Onsager-type theory appropriately generalised for weakly helical director fields with pitch $k \ll \ell^{-1}$ [43, 44]. The Helmholtz free energy density F per unit volume V depends on the one-particle orientational distribution $f(\hat{\mathbf{u}})$ reads up to quadratic order in k:

$$\frac{F}{V} = \rho \int d\hat{\mathbf{u}} f(\hat{\mathbf{u}})(\ln[\rho\mathcal{V} f(\hat{\mathbf{u}})] - 1) + \sum_{n=0}^{2} K_n (-k)^n / n!, \quad (6)$$

with ρ the particle number density and $\mathcal{V}$ the immaterial thermal volume of a helix. Eq. (6) reflects a balance between the ideal mixing and (local) orientational entropy and the excess free energy accounting for helix-helix interactions on the second-virial level in terms of the following angular averages [44]

$$K_n[f] = \frac{\rho^2}{2} \int d\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 \int d\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2 [\partial_n f(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1) f(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2)] M_n(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2), \quad (7)$$

in terms of the derivatives $\partial_0 = 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 &= u_{2\perp} \partial_{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2}, \\ \partial_2 &= u_{1\perp} \partial_{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1} u_{2\perp} \partial_{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

acting on f with $(\parallel, \perp)$ denoting the vector component along and transverse to the cholesteric pitch direction. The reference term, K_0 is associated with an untwisted nematic system, whereas K_1 embodies an effective torque-field emerging from the chiral potential. K_2 represent a twist elastic energy counteracting the helical deformation of the director field. The kernels Eq. (7) are entirely microscopic and are given by higher-order spatial averages of the Mayer function of the helical pair potential

$$M_n = -\int d\mathbf{r}_{12} r_{12\parallel}^n (e^{-U_h} - 1). \quad (9)$$

If we assume helix envelope to consist of a cylindrical hard inner core of diameter δ, then

$$M_0 = 2\ell^2\bar{\delta}|\sin\gamma|, \tag{10}$$

identical to the excluded volume $v_{\rm ex}$ of the cylinder-shaped helical envelope. The soft potential can be subsumed into an effective, angle-dependent diameter $\bar{\delta} = \varepsilon(\gamma)\delta$. The orientation-dependent prefactor reads

$$\varepsilon(\gamma) = 1 + \int_1^\infty dx(1 - \exp[-u_s(x)\cos^2(\gamma)]). \tag{11}$$

which reduces to unity for strictly hard rods ($u_s = 0$). The cosine term reflects the intrinsic tendency of attractive helix pairs to align and repulsive ones to adopt a perpendicular configuration [45]. Similar arguments can be applied to the twist elastic constant in which case the kernel is represented by some higher-dimensional excluded volume

$$M_2 = \frac{1}{6}\ell^4\bar{\delta}|\sin\gamma|(u_{1\|}^2 + u_{2\|}^2). \tag{12}$$

The symmetry of M_1 dictates that the torque-field constant K_1 depend only on the pseudo-scalar contribution ro the helix potential [Eq. (4)]. Recalling that $\bar{U}_c \ll 1$ and adopting a simple van der Waals ansatz one arives at a tractable form

$$M_1 \simeq \int_{\notin v_{\rm ex}} d\mathbf{r}_{12} r_{12\|} \bar{U}_c(\mathbf{r}_{12}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2), \tag{13}$$

where the spatial integral runs over the space complementary to the excluded volume $v_{\rm ex}$ of the helix envelope.

III. PITCH INVERSION

Most helically organised assemblies known in experiment possess a pitch length much larger than the molecular size. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the local nematic order is only marginally affected by the twisted director field. In this situation the local orientational distribution of the main helix axis $f(\hat{\mathbf{u}})$ can be established from a formal minimisation of the nematic free energy [Eq. (6), setting $k = 0$] so that

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \mathcal{N}\exp(-c\int d\hat{\mathbf{u}}'\varepsilon(\gamma)|\sin\gamma|f(\hat{\mathbf{u}}')), \tag{14}$$

where the constant $\mathcal{N}$ ensures normalisation and $c = \rho\ell^2\delta$ defines a dimensionless concentration measure. From f^* one can extract the nematic order parameter along the local director $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ via $S = \int d\hat{\mathbf{u}} f(\hat{\mathbf{u}})\mathcal{P}_2(\hat{\mathbf{u}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{n}})$ (with $\mathcal{P}_2(x) = \frac{3}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}$ a Legendre polynomial). The ratio of the microscopic constants K_i define the equilibrium cholesteric pitch



FIG. 3. (a) Cholesteric pitch length p_c versus concentration for a system of helical Yukawa rods with $\kappa\ell = 20$ and $\delta/\ell = 1/50$ for different values of the internal pitch $q\ell$. (b) Same result plotted against the local nematic order parameter S. A pitch sense inversion (right-handed $\leftrightarrow$ left-handed) occurs for $q\ell = 4$ and $q\ell = 7$.

$$k = K_1[f]/K_2[f]. \tag{15}$$

This result naturally follows from the extremum condition $\partial F/\partial k = 0$ and reflects a balance between the torque-field and twist elastic contributions to the free energy. In keeping with the internal pitch we identify $k^* > 0$ with a right-handed (R) helical director field and $k^* < 0$ with a left-handed (L) one. With this, we have established the desired connection between thermodynamic variables (concentration or temperature) and cholesteric pitch k^* for helical particles with arbitrary internal pitch q.

To illustrate the pitch sensitivity of cholesteric assemblies we now focus exclusively on lyotropic cholesterics composed of Yukawa helices for which the concentration c constitutes the main thermodynamic parameter. The results in fig. 3 show the variation of the cholesteric pitch length with c for different values of the internal pitch q. The cholesteric pitch has been normalised to its value corresponding to the cholesteric phase at coexistence with the isotropic phase ($c = 6.28$ setting $u_0 = 1$) to avoid having to make an explicit reference to the physico-chemical helix details that go into u_0 [40].

The helices corresponding to fig. 3 all possess a right-handed symmetry and one would naively expect the cholesteric phase to adopt the same symmetry. Fig. 3 shows that this is indeed the case for $q\ell = 3$ and $q\ell = 6$ where the cholesteric sense remains right-handed (R) throughout the probed concentration range, but not for $q\ell = 4$ and $q\ell = 7$. In the latter cases a more com-

plicated scenario if found in which a R-cholesteric phase transforms into a L-phase upon increasing c. The critical value at which the sense inversion occurs is found to be $c \approx 17.6$ for the weakly coiled ($q\ell = 4$) and $c \approx 11.4$ for the strongly coiled ones ($q\ell = 7$). The transition from R to L is continuous and must be associated with a diverging pitch length $p_c \propto |c - c^*|^{-1}$ at the inversion point c^* where the system becomes nematic. For $c < c^*$ the pitch strongly decreases upon lowering c and a distinct unwinding of the helical director field occurs close to the transition towards the isotropic phase. Symmetry prescribes the same sequence of pitch changes to occur for *left-handed* helices with the sense changing R $\rightarrow$ L upon dilution. Independent of q the cholesteric becomes more strongly coiled upon increasing concentration and the pitch length attains a simple proportionality $p_c \propto 1/c$ in the asymptotic concentration limit [46].

Eq. (4) presents a schematic overview of the interrelation between microscopic and cholesteric chirality. We can infer that pitch inversions upon change of local nematic alignment only occur in certain q interval while absent in others. The pitch amplitude (fig. 4b) depends sensitively on q with the pronounced extremum around $|q|\ell \sim 3$ revealing an optimal 'twisting strength' for moderately coiled nanohelices [40]. As alluded to in fig. 2, the sense inversion is imbedded in the intricate dependence of the chiral potential on the microscopic twist angle γ. A prerequisite for the pitch inversion is the presence of an *antagonistic* effect in the azimuthally averaged interhelix potential represented by minima located at opposite sign of the angle γ between the main helix axes. The ratio at which these minima are sampled depends crucially on the degree of nematic alignment around the local director and a change of nematic order (by varying particle concentration or temperature) allows the helix pairs to preferentially adopt either a positive or negative twist which then proliferates towards the formation of a left- or right-handed director field.

In view of the similarity between the scenarios depicted in fig. 2 one can envisage an analogous pitch inversion for attractive van der Waals segment potentials. This situation would correspond to thermotropic helical assemblies where a change of temperature k_BT/u_0 (at fixed pressure) provides the main driving force for liquid crystal order. The present theory could therefore also be used to model thermotropic systems of coiled molecules in which a similar complex interplay between micro- and macrochirality can be expected by variation of temperature.



FIG. 4. (a) Relation between the cholesteric pitch k and internal pitch q as a function of the degree of local nematic order S. The sign and strength of the cholesteric pitch (in reduced units) is indicated by colour coding. The white zones refer to nematic regions ($q = 0$) connecting the two helical senses. (b) Absolute value of the cholesteric pitch $k\ell$ for two values of the local nematic order parameter.

IV. CONCLUSION

We propose a course-grained helical segment model to study chiral self-organisation in lyotropic or thermotropic assemblies of helical mesogens. From the general pair potential we extract an algebraic chiral potential similar to the pseudoscalar form [31] widely used to describe long-ranged chiral dispersion forces. Whereas the pseudoscalar model potential usually requires an unknown adjustable prefactor, our agebraic form provides explicit reference to the molecular helicity. By combining the potential with a simple Onsager-Straley theory we study the cholesteric pitch as a function of the magnitude and sense of the pitch as well the thermodynamic state. The cholesteric handedness is not a priori dictated by the symmetry of the individual helices but depends sensitively on the precise value of the internal pitch and the thermodynamic state of the system. We map out the precise conditions under which right-handed helices generate left-handed chiral phases and vice versa. The antagonistic effect of helical interactions is consistent with experimental observations in *M13* virus systems [47] and various types of DNA [5, 29] where left-handed cholesteric phases are formed from right-handed helical polyelectrolyte conformations. Small variations in the shape of the helical coil, induced by e.g. a change of temperature, may lead to a sense inversion of the helical director. Such inversions have been found in thermotropic (solvent free) polypeptides [38], cellulose derivatives [39], and in mixtures of right-handed cholesterol chloride and left-handed cholesterol myristate [48].

The present model could be interpreted as a benchmark for complex biomacromolecules such as DNA and *fd* which are characterised by a helical distribution of charged surface groups. Other lyotropic cholesteric systems, such as cellulose and chitin microfibers in solution could also be conceived as charged rods with a twisted

charge distribution [12]. A more accurate description of the pitch sensitivity, particularly for DNA systems, could be achieved by taking into account the steric contributions associated with the helical backbone of the chains as well as the influence of chain flexibility. This could open up a route towards understanding the unusual behaviour of the pitch versus particle and salt concentration as encountered in DNA [5, 15, 49] using simple coarse-grained models.

Last not least, in view of their intricate interplay between micro- and macrochirality assemblies of helical particles could be exploited for photonic applications as well as the design of opto-electronic switching devices with improved performance and controllability [50].

[1] S. M. Aharoni, Macromolecules **12**, 94 (1979).
[2] T. Sato, Y. Sato, Y. Umemura, A. Teramoto, Y. Nagamura, J. Wagner, D. Weng, Y. Okamoto, K. Hatada, and M. M. Green, Macromolecules **26**, 4551 (1993).
[3] J. Watanabe, H. Kamee, and M. Fujiki, Polym. J. **33**, 495 (2001).
[4] C. Robinson, Tetrahedron **13**, 219 (1961).
[5] F. Livolant and A. Leforestier, Prog. Polym. Sci. **21**, 1115 (1996).
[6] Z. Dogic and S. Fraden, Curr. Opin. Colloid Interface Sci. **11**, 47 (2006).
[7] I. Uematsu and Y. Uematsu, Adv. Pol. Sci. **59**, 37 (1984).
[8] D. B. DuPré and E. T. Samulski, in *Liquid Crystals: the Fourth State of Matter*, edited by F. D. Saeva (Dekker, New York, 1979).
[9] K. Hiltrop, in *Chirality in Liquid Crystals*, edited by H. S. Kitzerow and C. Bahr (Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001).
[10] T. Sato and A. Teramoto, Adv. Polym. Sci. **126**, 85 (1996).
[11] R. S. Werbowyj and D. G. Gray, Mol. Cryst. Liquid Cryst. **34**, 97 (1976).
[12] J.-F. Revol and R. H. Marchessault, Int. J. Biol. Macromol. **15**, 329 (1993).
[13] D. H. van Winkle, M. W. Davidson, W. X. Chen, and R. L. Rill, Macromolecules **23**, 4140 (1990).
[14] Y. M. Yevdokimov, S. G. Skuridin, and V. I. Salyanov, Liq. Cryst. **3**, 1443 (1988).
[15] C. B. Stanley, H. Hong, and H. H. Strey, Biophys. J. **89**, 2552 (2005).
[16] Z. Dogic and S. Fraden, Langmuir **16**, 7820 (2000).
[17] E. Grelet and S. Fraden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 198302 (2003).
[18] D. B. DuPré and R. W. Duke, J. Chem. Phys. **63**, 143 (1975).
[19] K. Yoshiba, A. Teramoto, N. Nakamura, and T. Sato, Macromolecules **36**, 2108 (2003).
[20] X. M. Dong and D. G. Gray, Langmuir **13**, 2404 (1997).
[21] A. F. Miller and A. M. Donald, Biomacromolecules **4**, 510 (2003).
[22] X. M. Dong, T. Kimura, J. F. Revol, and D. G. Gray, Langmuir **12**, 2076 (1996).
[23] P. G. de Gennes and J. Prost, *The Physics of Liquid Crystals* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993).
[24] J. P. Straley, Phys. Rev. A **8**, 2181 (1973).
[25] A. Jákli, C. Bailey, and J. Harden, in *Thermotropic Liquid Crystals*, edited by A. Ramamoorthi (Springer, Netherlands, 2007), p. 59.
[26] H. Kimura, M. Hosino, and H. Nakano, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **51**, 1584 (1982).
[27] W. J. Orts, L. Godbout, R. H. Marchessault, and J.-F. Revol, Macromolecules **31**, 5717 (1998).
[28] R. A. Pelcovits, Liq. Cryst. **21**, 361 (1996).
[29] F. Tombolato and A. Ferrarini, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 054908 (2005).
[30] E. Frezza, A. Ferrarini, H. B. Kolli, A. Giacometti, and G. Cinacchi, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 164906 (2013).
[31] W. J. A. Goossens, Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst. **12**, 237 (1971).
[32] R. Berardi, H. Kuball, R. Memmer, and C. Zannoni, J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. **94**, 1229 (1998).
[33] B. W. van der Meer, G. Vertogen, A. J. Dekker, and J. G. J. Ypma, J. Chem. Phys. **65**, 3935 (1976).
[34] Y. R. Lin-Liu, Y. M. Shih, and C. W. Woo, Phys. Rev. A **15**, 2550 (1977).
[35] L. Onsager, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. **51**, 627 (1949).
[36] S. Varga and G. Jackson, Mol. Phys. **104**, 3681 (2006).
[37] H. H. Wensink and G. Jackson, J. Chem. Phys. **130**, 234911 (2009).
[38] J. Watanabe and T. Nagase, Macromolecules **21**, 171 (1988).
[39] T. Yamagishi, T. Fukada, T. Miyamoto, T. Ichizuka, and J. Watanabe, Liq. Cryst. **7**, 155 (1990).
[40] H. H. Wensink and G. Jackson, J. Phys.; Condens. Matter **23**, 194107 (2011).
[41] J. N. Israelachvili, *Intermolecular and surface forces* (Academic Press, London, 1991).
[42] A. B. Harris, R. D. Kamien, and T. C. Lubensky, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1745 (1999).
[43] J. P. Straley, Phys. Rev. A **14**, 1835 (1976).
[44] M. P. Allen, G. T. Evans, D. Frenkel, and B. M. Mulder, Adv. Chem. Phys. **86**, 1 (1993).
[45] A. Stroobants, H. N. W. Lekkerkerker, and T. Odijk, Macromolecules **19**, 2232 (1986).
[46] T. Odijk, J. Phys. Chem. **91**, 6060 (1987).
[47] F. Tombolato, A. Ferrarini, and E. Grelet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 258302 (2006).
[48] E. Sackmann, S. Meiboom, L. C. Snyder, A. E. Meixner, and R. E. Dietz, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **90**, 3567 (1968).
[49] G. Zanchetta, F. Giavazzi, M. Nakata, M. Buscaglia, R. Cerbino, N. A. Clark, and T. Bellini, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (USA) **107**, 17497 (2010).
[50] V. Kopp, Z. Zhang, and A. Genack, Prog. Quantum Electron. **27**, 369 (2003).